



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/049,327

05/15/2002

Jay M Meythaler

UAB-15102/22

3596

51279

7590

11/24/2009

GIFFORD, KRASS, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON &
CITKOWSKI, P.C.

P.O. BOX 7021

TROY, MI 48007-7021

EXAMINER

CRUZ, KATHRIEN ANN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1628

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/24/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/049,327	Applicant(s) MEYTHALER ET AL.	
	Examiner KATHRIEN CRUZ	Art Unit 1628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,7,29,34-36 and 40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,7,29,34-36 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 7, 29, 34-36 and 40 are pending.

Applicants response dated June 1, 2009 has been received and entered into the application.

Priority

This application has claimed priority to application PCT/US00/21893 filed 08/10/2000 that claim benefits to provisional application 60/148, 068 filed 08/10/1999.

Action Summary

Claim 1, 29 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.112, first paragraph is maintained.

Claims 1, 7, 29, 34-36 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breitner et al (U.S. Patent 5,643,960) in view of Bustamante et al (Effects of Intrathecal or Intracerebroventricular Administration of Nonsteroidal Anti-inflammatory Drugs on a C-Fiber Reflex in Rats, Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, Vol. 281. No.3, 1997) and Grilli (WO 98/20864), all of the references are of record, is maintained.

Response to Arguments

Applicants submit that a person of ordinary skills in the art has ample guidance concerning how to make and use a prodrugs of CMT. This argument has been fully considered but has not been found persuasive. In order to make all forms of prodrugs would require an extensive amount of experimentation to determine that the active sites of such prodrugs are effective in the treatment of inflammation. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph is deemed proper.

Applicants argue that Breitner is not cited as neurotrauma with CMT. And that is no suggestion that any NSAIDS may be used as such. This argument has been fully considered but has not been found persuasive.). Breitner teaches that the Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory agents suitable for delaying the onset of **Alzheimer's disease or related neurodegenerative disorders** associated with excitotoxic neuronal cell death (for example, Huntington's disease, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, epilepsy, Parkinson's disease, and Pick's disease). In the present invention include the arylcarboxylic acids (**salicylic acid, acetylsalicylic acid**, diflunisal, **choline magnesium trisalicylate**, salicylate (column 3, lines 39). And Breitner teaches that all of these NSAIDs are potent inhibitors of cyclooxygenase (COX). And Bustamante teaches a method of administering intrathecally aspirin with a dosage range from 10µg to 500µg and other NSAIDs with a dosage range from 100µg to 500µg (table 1) (page 1383). Grilli et al. teaches the treatment of Alzheimer's disease through the use of NSAIDs (Abstract). Sodium salicylate and salicylamide are specifically taught as NSAIDs useful in the invention disclosed therein (page 3, lines 1-10). Neuronal

Art Unit: 1628

damages (i.e. neurotrauma or neuronal injury) related to Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, spinal traumas and cranial traumas as well as other neurodegenerative processes are specifically taught as treatable by the NSAIDs disclosed. It would have been obvious to administer CMT for delaying the onset of Alzheimer's disease or related neurodegenerative disease as taught by Breitner and to further employ deacetylated aspirin for the treatment of Alzheimer's disease associated with neuronal injuries because it is known in the art that non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs can be used in the treatment of glutamate receptor-mediated neuronal damages, independently of any anti-inflammatory properties as taught by Grilli. Therefore the rejection under 35 U.S.C 103(a) is deemed proper.

For the ease of the applicant the previous office action dated March 4, 2009 is reproduced below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1, 29 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making and using salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonable provide enablement for making and using solvates or hydrates of the claimed compounds. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was

Art Unit: 1628

not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art of medicinal chemistry to use the invention. "The factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection have been summarized as a) the quantity of experimentation necessary, b) the amount of direction or guidance presented, c) the presence or absence of working examples, d) the nature of the invention, e) the state of the prior art, f) the relative skill of those in that art, g) the predictability or unpredictability of that art, h) and the breadth of the claims", *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *ex parte formal*, 230 USPQ 546. a) Finding a solvates or hydrates is an empirical exercise. Predicting if a certain ester of claimed alcohol, for example, is in fact a solvates or hydrates, that produces the active compound metabolically, in man, at a therapeutic concentration and at a useful rate is filled with experimental uncertainty. Although attempts have been made to predict drug metabolism *de novo*, this is still an experimental science. For a compound to be a solvates or hydrates, it must meet three tests. It must itself be biologically inactive. It must be metabolized to a second substance in a human at a rate and to an extent to produce that second substance at a physiologically meaningful concentration. Thirdly, that second substance must be clinically effective. Determining whether a particular compound meets these three criteria in a clinical trial setting requires a large quantity of experimentation.

b) The direction concerning the solvates or hydrates is found in the specification on page 21. c) There is no working example of a solvates or hydrates of a compound the formula II. d) The nature of the invention is clinical use of compounds and the pharmacokinetic behavior of substances in the human body. e) Wolff (Medicinal

Art Unit: 1628

Chemistry) summarizes the state of the prodrugs art. Wolff, Manfred E. "Burger's Medicinal Chemistry, 5ed, Part I", John Wiley & Sons, 1995, pages 975-977. The table on the left side of page 976 outlines the research program to be undertaken to fine a prodrug. The second paragraph in section 10 and the paragraph spanning pages 976-977 indicated the low expectation of success. In that paragraph the difficulties of extrapolating between species are further developed. Since, the solvates or hydrates concept is a pharmacokinetic issue, the lack of any standard pharmacokinetic protocol discussed in the last sentence is particularly relevant. f) It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved", and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPQ 1970). g) The breadth of the claims includes all of the hundreds of thousand of compounds of formula of claim 1 as well as the presently unknown list of potential solvates or hydrates embraced by claim 1.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "[a] conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993

Art Unit: 1628

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 7, 29, 34-36 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breitner et al (U.S. Patent 5,643,960) in view of Bustamante et al (Effects of Intrathecal or Intracerebroventricular Administration of Nonsteroidal Anti-inflammatory Drugs on a C-Fiber Reflex in Rats, Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, Vol. 281. No.3, 1997) and Grilli (WO 98/20864), all of the references are of record.

Art Unit: 1628

Breitner teaches a method of delaying the onset of Alzheimer's disease or related neurodegenerative disorders associated with excitotoxic neuronal cell death (for example, Huntington's disease, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, epilepsy, Parkinson's disease, and Pick's disease). The method comprises administering to an individual at risk of developing the disease (or disorder) an amount of a nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory agent (column 3, lines 7-14). Breitner teaches that the Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory agents suitable for use in the present invention include the arylcarboxylic acids (salicylic acid, acetylsalicylic acid, diflunisal, choline magnesium trisalicylate, salicylate (column 3, lines 39). Breitner teaches that all of these NSAIDs are potent inhibitors of cyclooxygenase (COX) (column 3, line 51-52).

Breitner does not expressly teach administering NSAIDs intrathecally or intraventricularly, and further administering a deacetylated aspirin (an active metabolite of aspirin) for the treating of Alzheimer's disease associated with neuronal cell death.

Bustamante teaches a method of administering intrathecally aspirin with a dosage range from 10tJg to 500tJg and other NSAIDs with a dosage range from 100tJg to 500tJg (table 1) (page 1383). Bustamante teaches a method of administering intracerebroventricularly aspirin with a dosage of 500 tJg and NSAIDs with a dosage of 250 or 500tJg (table 1) (page 1383).

Grilli et al. teaches the treatment of Alzheimer's disease through the use of NSAIDs (Abstract). Sodium salicylate and salicylamide are specifically taught as NSAIDs useful in the invention disclosed therein (page 3, lines 1-10). Neuronal damages (i.e. neurotrauma or neuronal injury) related to Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, spinal traumas and cranial traumas as well as other neurodegenerative processes are specifically taught as treatable by the NSAIDs disclosed therein (page 6, lines 9-20). Grilli et al. teach, on page 5, lines 1-10, that non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs can be used in the prevention and/or treatment of glutamate receptor-mediated neuronal damages, independently of any anti-inflammatory properties. Grilli et al teaches that a preferred embodiment is the use of ASA or of its metabolite (e.g., deacetylated aspirin), for the treatment of glutamate receptor-mediated neuronal damages (page 3, lines 11-14). Further the NSAIDs show a protective activity against glutamate-induced neurotoxicity.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Breitner to include the administration of NSAIDs intrathecally or intraventricularly. One would be motivated to make such a modification because anti-inflammatory agents and aspirin may be administered intrathecally and intracerebroventricularly as taught by Bustamante. The amounts of active agents to be used, the pharmaceutical forms, e.g., tablets, etc; mode of administration, flavors, surfactant are all deemed obvious since they are all within the knowledge of the skilled pharmacologist and represent conventional formulations and

Art Unit: 1628

modes of administration. Furthermore, no unobviousness is seen in the ratio claimed because once the usefulness of a compound is known to treat a condition, it is within the skill of the artisan to determine the optimum ratio.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate deacetylated aspirin in the method of Breitner to treat Alzheimer's disease associated with neuronal injuries because it is known in the art that non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs can be used in the treatment of glutamate receptor-mediated neuronal damages, independently of any anti-inflammatory properties as taught by Grilli. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a modification because employing any known NSAID, including ASA or of its metabolite (i.e., deacetylated aspirin), for the treatment of neuronal damages as taught in Breitner would be reasonably expected to be effective. At least additive effect is expected.

In light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner concludes that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103(a).

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Conclusion

Claims 1,7, 29, 34-36 and 40 are rejected.

No claims allowed.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KATHRIEN CRUZ whose telephone number is (571)270-5238. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 7:00am - 5:00pm with every Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brandon Fetterolf can be reached on (571) 272-2919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1628

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/KATHRIEN CRUZ/
Examiner, Art Unit 1628

/San-ming Hui/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1628